

# **COLCHESTER PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**August 3, 2010**

**PRESENT:** Tom Mulcahy, Pam Loranger, Tim Ahonen, and Rich Paquette.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Sarah Hadd, Director

### **1. Call to Order**

**Tom Mulcahy** called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m. Robert Scheck was absent

### **2. Discussion of Planned Unit Development**

T. Mulcahy asked if input was received from the DRB or SB. S. Hadd stated that Peter Larrabee of the DRB was the only one that has provided comment and he was favorable to reducing the PUD size to 1.5 acres. Roger Bourassa of the DRB stated that there was not enough information to provide comment and requested a meeting. DRB members were invited to the meeting tonight and none were present.

R. Scheck joined the Commission at 7:13 PM.

T. Mulcahy asked if the PUD size reduction could be applied to some of the Town and not all of it. S. Hadd stated that there would have to be clear reasons why some areas would be afforded the relief and not others. T. Mulcahy asked if tear-downs and structures that were out of character with the area became a problem what the Town's recourse would be. P. Loranger stated that design review could be implemented. R. Paquette stated that he had no issue allowing the reduction for the entire Town. T. Ahonen stated that it might help to replace structures that have reached the end of their life cycle. T. Mulcahy stated that a presentation from the Commission should be made at the first reading of the supplement to the Select Board if it is advanced.

The cumulative changes since May 2010 proposed to the Planned Unit Development regulations include the following:

1. Reduce the minimum acreage requirement for PUD's in Section 9.01C(3) from five acres to 1.5 acres.
2. Change 9.01C to do away with the requirement for a density plan with each application.
3. Clarify Section 9.01C(5) to specify Class II and III wetlands and floodplains instead of "wet areas and soils unsuitable for development".
4. Specify in Section 9.01C(9) that the PUD buffer of 50 feet is for residential districts and not commercial.

5. Section 9.01D(1) delete GD District to clearly state that the waiver of dimensional standards, not just setbacks, is applicable to all districts per current practice of the DRB.
6. Change Section 9.01D(3) to allow for the use of structured recreational areas within open space in the GD1 District.
7. Change Section 5.03 to eliminate a 45 foot setback for gas canopies in the Business District.

Tim Ahonen made a **motion** to warn Supplement 29 and P. Loranger **seconded**. The **motion** passed with a vote of 5-0.

### **3. Discussion of Design Review**

Design review is usually undertaken to preserve or create a sense of place in areas experiencing structural change. While it is most often the regulation of how buildings look, it can also be applied to streetscapes and exterior lighting. T. Mulcahy stated that there seemed to be several ways to do design review and perhaps the easiest to accept was to regulate historic structures. T. Ahonen provided some information on Burlington's regulations and that materials and colors were regulated. T. Mulcahy stated that he was thinking much more broad than that. The Commission enumerated that perhaps the areas of concern were the Village, Severance Corners, the Bay, and Heineberg / Prim Roads. S. Hadd stated that perhaps the Bay should be looked at comprehensively with the underlying zoning. T. Mulcahy asked for information on what South Burlington and Williston do for design review. S. Hadd stated that she would provide additional information for the next meeting.

### **4. Review of Future Agendas**

S. Hadd stated that S29 would likely be on the September 7<sup>th</sup> agenda. T. Mulcahy requested a presentation for the public meeting. R. Scheck stated that he would try to put together a presentation with S. Hadd's help. S. Hadd asked if there were any other work items for the FY11 workplan. T. Ahonen suggested that an infrastructure discussion would be helpful. There were no other items for discussion.

### **5. Packet information**

S. Hadd stated that Supplement 5 to the Subdivision Regulations was going for a first reading on August 10 to the Select Board.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to be brought before the Commission, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. All members of the Commission present voted in favor of the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Minutes taken and respectfully submitted by Jane Dion.

Approved this 17th day of August 2010

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	<b>Planning Commission</b>